



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/208,962	12/10/1998	RICHARD A. ELCO	4414-D	8858

7590

06/11/2002

BRIAN J HAMILLA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW DEPARTMENT
FCI/BERG ELECTRONICS GROUP INC
825 OLD TRAIL RD
ETTERS, PA 17319

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/208962

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

2839

Me

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-9-02

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-17, 41, 42 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-17, 41, 42 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6 sheets

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Claim 1, line 14, improperly repeats line 5.

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Fedder in view of Teka, Noschese, Swamy, Romine, Seidler, Feldman, Apap, Johary and Kandybowski. See last Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kandybowski in view of Johary, Apap, Swamy, Teka, Romine and Noschese. See last Office Action.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to Fedder, the argument regarding fig. 12 is noted, however the contact 104 widened end portions that engage pins 54 are seen define a structure that is generally planar and transverse to the ground contacts 115 and that together with ground contacts 115 define an I-beam structure. In addition, it would have been obvious to omit one arm of socket 104 in which case the remaining arm would clearly be readable as transverse to ground contacts 115 and as being planar.

For Kandybowski, fig. 4, connector 84, it would have been obvious to provide a third row of signal contacts 106 on each side of the connector and to use planar grounds between all rows of signal contacts. In the resultant article, the central contact 106 rows would meet claim language. This change would be the obvious ^{way} to increase signal capacity.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 2839

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

N. Abrams/mm

06/10/02


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322